DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 484 CG 021 129

AUTHOR Bauer, Allison
TITLE Learned Helplessness: Shifts in Affect Following Uncontrollability and the Relationship to Attributional Style.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 38p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attribution Theory; Cognitive Style; College Students; Depression (Psychology); *Helplessness; Higher Education; Locus of Control; Research Needs; *Sex Differences

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the reformulated theory of learned helplessness, centering around attributional style in the cause of cognitive and emotional deficits. Subjects (N=58) were undergraduate and graduate psychology students at the University of Alabama at Huntsville. Subjects were divided into an experimental group (N=30) who received uncontrollability and a control group (N=28) who received controllability. An assessment was made for subsequent changes in performance and affect following treatment. The procedure used locus of control and depressive score measures to investigate four hypotheses: (1) experimental group will evidence cognitive and emotional deficits following uncontrollability; (2) an increase in symptoms of learned helplessness will be produced in internal, stable, and global subjects; (3) experimental females will become more depressed than experimental males; and (4) subjects with positive performance perceptions will be internal attributers. Results supported all hypotheses except the third. The theory of reactance may explain the cognitive deficits that were produced as an alternative to Seligman's theory of learned helplessness. The need for further research in the area of induced cognitive deficits is indicated. (Twenty-two references are listed, and appended materials include a consent form, instructions, check lists and questionnaires, response forms, and a debriefing statement.) (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED299484

Learned Helplessness: Shifts in Affect Following Uncontrollability and the Relationship to Attributional Style

Allison Bauer

The University of Alabama in Huntsville

CG 021129

Running Head: LEARNED HELPLESSNESS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Allison Bauer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The reformulated theory of learned helplessness, centering around attributional style, was investigated in the cause of cognitive and emotional deficits. Sixty subjects were devided into experimental (receiving uncontrollability) and control (receiving controllability) groups. An assessment was made for subsequent changes in performance and affect following treatment. The procedure used locus of control and depressive score measures to investigate four hypotheses: (a) experimental group will evidence cognitive and emotional deficits following uncontrollability; (b) an increase in symptoms of learned helplessness will be produced in internal, stable, global Ss.; (c) experimental females will become more depressed than experimental males; (d) Ss. with positive performance perceptions will be internal attributers. Results supported all hypotheses with the exception of (c). T-tests significance levels consistently fell at or below the .05 level. The theory of reactance was offered as an explanation for the cognitive deficits that were produced as an alternative to Seligman's theory of learned helplessness. Conclusions implicated the need for further research in the area of induced cognitive deficits.

LEARNED HELPLESSNESS: SHIFTS IN AFFECT FOLLOWING UNCONTROLLABILITY AND THE RELATIONSHIP TO ATTRIBUTIONAL STYLE

Learned helplessness is defined as a directional cognitive, emotional, and motivational deficit learned under conditions of failure and often occurs as a response to uncontrollability when the outcome of an event is independent of all voluntary responses. The learned helplessness model is supported by experimental evidence that when an organism is placed in uncontrollable circumstances a subsequent disruption of behavior will be present and measurable in terms of cognitive performance, emotional state, and motivational state (Maier & Seligman, 1976). The original hypothesis concerning learned helplessness predicted that perceived uncontrollability induces motivational, emotional, and performance deficits but did not account for personality differences between subjects and degrees of helplessness as a function of the personality factor. The reformulated model of learned helplessness (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978) was a response to findings which demonstrated that uncontrollability did not invariably induce subsequent performance deficits (Cole & Coyne, 1977; Roth & Kubal, 1975), but was dependent upon personality factors.

The reformulated model centers around attribution theory and an individual's reaction to an uncontrollable event as influenced by the attributional style. Attribution is displayed as three

continuums, each with two dimensions. The three attributional continuums are external to internal, specific to global, and unstable to stable. Internal attribution makes the event attributional to self, external attribution makes the event attributable to factors other than self; stable attribution refers to factors persistent over time, and unstable attribution refers to transient factors; global attribution generalizes the cause of the event to all situations, and specific attribution limits the cause of the event to a unique factor.

The reformulated model of learned helplessness has also been proposed as a model of depression (Peterson & Seligman, 1984). The individual's affective state is an element which may enhance deficits produced by uncontrollability or may be changed significantly after an experience of uncontrollability. Depression and its intensity, chronicity, and generality are hypothesized to be the result of the individual's attributional style. Depressive individuals tend to make internal, stable, and global attributions (Kupier, 1978; Raps, Peterson, Reinhard, Abramson, & Seligman, 1982) for uncontrollable events, whereas nondepressive individuals tend to make external, unstable, and specific attributions for uncontrollable events (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978). The reformulation makes a necessary and useful distinction between the attributional style of depressives and nondepressives preceding and following uncontrollable events. The attributional style of an individual influences future contingency or noncontingency

perceptions, as well as response and outcome behaviors.

In assessing the degree of emotional, cognitive, and motivational deficits, it is necessary to return to the original learned helplessness hypothesis. In the original hypothesis, Seligman (1975) identified three factors that limit the effects of uncontrollability: prior immunization leading to expectancy of control over outcomes, perception of the uncontrollable event as trivial relative to subsequent tasks, and ability to discriminate between the uncontrollable event and subsequent tasks perceived as dissimilar. These factors may inhibit or enhance induction of helplessness under experimental conditions.

This experiment investigates the cognitive and emotional consequences of uncontrollability and the relationship to an individual's attributional style plus the degree of performance deficit and shift in affect. Both male and female, experimental and control subjects, received the same treatment with the exception of failure and uncontrollability for the experimental group on a pretreatment concept formation task (Richardson & Bhavani, 1984). All experimental and control subjects received correct feedback on the second concept formation task and results on performance and pre/post affective measures were compared for both groups. The experimental design and materials were used to investigate four hypotheses all supported within the literature on learned helplessness (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978; Alloy & Abramson, 1979; Baucom, 1983; Golin, Sweeney, & Shaffer, 1981; Maier & Seilgman, 1976; Mikulincer, 1986). The hypotheses are as

follows: (a) two deficits, cognitive and emotional, will be produced in experimental subjects following pretreatment with failure and uncontrollability on a concept formation task; (b) an attributional style of internal, stable, global will predispose subjects toward induction of learned helplessness and will cause greater cognitive and emotional deficits; (c) experimental females will be expected to show a greater degree of depression than experimental males; (d) both experimental and control subjects who perceive they did well on the concept formation tasks will evidence an internal attributional style.

Method

Subjects

Sixty graduate and undergraduate psychology students from the University of Alabama in Huntsville served as subjects. There were 29 male and 29 female subjects with a mean age of 25.3. All subjects resided within a 60 mile radius of Huntsville, Alabama. Two subjects were discarded due to erroneous behavior. There were 30 experimental subjects and 28 control subjects both matched in number for gender. Treatment of all participants was in accordance with principal nine of the ethical standards of the American Psychological Association.

Materials

Materials included a general release form (see Appendix A) which informed subjects of the time requirement, confidentiality, and a brief overview of the procedures involved, with the understanding that the experiment could be terminated at any time.

A portion of the Depression Adjective Checklist (DACL) (Lubin, 1981), forms E, F, and G, was also utilized (see Appendix B). Each form contained 34 adjectives, both positive and negative. Scores were obtained by assigning one point to each positive adjective checked and one point to each negative adjective not checked. The total score was the sum of the positive and negative scores. Higher scores indicated elevated degrees of depression.

The Rotter Locus of Control Test (Rotter, 1966) a 29-item, self-administered questionnaire was used as a measure of the internal to external continuum of attributional style (see Appendix C). Items contrast internal locus of control with external locus of control. According to Rotter (1966), internal individuals believe that reinforcements are contingent upon their own behavior, capacities, or attributes, while external individuals believe that reinforcements are under the control of, luck, chance, or fate. Scores were obtained by giving a subject one point for each external attribution selected. Subjects with scores below 10 were considered internal and subjects with scores of 10 and above were considered external.

Other materials included were instructions and a concept formation task similar to that described by Wenar (1983), (see Appendix D). The task was one of discrimination learning in which a subject was presented with a succession of stimuli consisting of six sets of 10 cards each. Within each set, one of eight possible

responses was predetermined to be correct. Each subject was given feedback on the basis of being told that a chosen response was either correct or incorrect and scores reflected the number of correct concepts chosen. The total score indicated subjects' performance on the task. A measure was also taken of the number of "correct" feedback responses received by each subject.

An unpublished questionnaire called the Bauer Attributional Style Questionnaire (BASQ) (see Appendix E) (Bauer, 1987) was used after the second concept formation task. The questionnaire assesed all three continuums of attributional style and the subjects' perception of performance on all experimental tasks.

The debriefing statement (see Appendix F) provided subjects with a brief explanation of the objectives of the experiment. It also included a list of subjective questions pertaining to subjects' emotional state following both the first and second concept formation tasks. Data from the debriefing statement not used in the final analysis of results.

Design

The experimental design for this study was a 2 x 2 factoral design. It was the objective of the experiment to induce a negative cognitive set through faulty feedback. The two variables that were manipulated within this experiment were gender (male and female) and feedback (controllable and uncontrollable). Incorrect feedback was given at predetermined intervals on sets one through three, making it impossible for the subject to experience success. The control group was given correct feedback on sets one through

three, thus success was contingent upon ability. Both groups were given correct feedback on sets four through six.

Procedure

The researchers were seven undergraduate psychology students, attending The University of Alabama in Huntsville. All volunteer subjects were tested individually in similar experimental settings, either on campus, at the residence of the experimenter, or the subject's place of residence.

Initially, a subject was asked to read and sign a general release form and then was administered The Rotter Locus of Control Test and DACL (Forms E, F, and G). Then the subject was given a copy of instructions for the concept formation tasks while the reasearcher read instructions aloud. Thus, the individual received both visual and auditory instructions. The instructions were:

> The purpose of this experiment is to figure out the correct answer from a series of 10 cards. In each set of cards, the answer is one of eight responses that was pre-determined to be correct. The eight possible answers are one of the following: Circle, square, 'L', 'Z', orange, green, small letter or large letter. Please say (right) or (left) to indicate which side you feel the correct answer is on and after each answer, I will tell you if your choice is correct or incorrect. Then we will go to the next card. For example, if you feel 'Z' is correct, then choose the side on which 'Z'

appears. At first you will use trial and error, but after a few trials you should be able to determine the correct answer. Do you have any questions? Once the experiment begins, please do not ask any questions. Now we will begin. Remember to say (left) or (right) to indicate if the correct answer is one of the following: circle, square, L, Z, orange, green, small letter or large letter.

Once the researcher was assured that the subject clearly understood the instructions, the subject was given sets one through three of the concept formation task; control subjects were given correct feedback, while experimental subjects were given incorrect (faulty) feedback. Upon completion of sets one through three, the DACL (Forms E, F, and G) was administered. Then the subject was given sets four through six of the concept formation task with correct feedback given to both the experimental and control groups on the second set. After completion, the BASQ was administered and the subject was debriefed.

Results

Analysis of subjects' scores on The Rotter Locus of Control Test indicated that the experimental females were significantly more external than the experimental males (t (28) = 3.57, $p<.05$). This effected differential measures on scores between males and females and between control and experimental groups as well. Initial scores on the DACL differed significantly between control

and experimental groups (t (56) = 19.08, $p<.05$). The mean score of the experimental group was higher, indicating that the experimental group entered the experiment in a more depressed state overall.

As suggested in Table 1, there were no significant differences between experimental and control groups on the number of concepts correctly identified on the second three concept formation tasks. There was, however, a significant difference between experimental and control groups on the DACL administered after pretreatment. The mean score of the experimental group was significantly higher (t (56) = 26.20, $p<.05$). The initial differences between the experimental and the control groups did not account entirely for the differences in post DACL scores, as indicated by the differential DACL measure between experimental and control groups (t (56) = 31.21, $p<.05$).

Insert Table 1 about here

Table 2 indicates differences found among subjects' attributional style as measured by the BASQ. Significant differences were present between experimental and control groups. The experimental group was significantly more external than the control group (t (26) = 7.58, $p<.05$), more unstable than the control group (t (56) = 6.88, $p<.05$), and more specific than the

control group (t (56) = 14.7, $p<.05$). A composite of experimental and control males and females revealed no significance differences between males and females in attributional style as measured by the BASQ. However, between males and females within the control group, a significant differnce on the external to internal measure was present (t (26) = 4.94, $p<.05$). Control males scored more external than control females. Within the experimental group, significant differences were found between males and females on the unstable to stable, and specific to global measures of attributional style. Male experimental subjects were significantly more unstable (t (28) = 6.20, $p<.05$), and more global than female experimental subjects (t (14) = 2.60, $p<.05$).

Insert Table 2 about here

Differences in perception and attributional style were also indicated. Subjects in both the experimental (t (12) = 3.84, $p<.05$) and control groups (t (26) = 8.37, $p<.05$) who felt they did well on the tasks were more global than those who felt they did not do well (t (28) = 2.42, $p<.05$). There was also a significant difference between female experimental subjects who felt they did well and female experimental subjects who felt they did not do well on the external to internal and specific to global measures.

Those who felt they did well were significantly more internal (t (13) = 2.22, $p<.05$) and more global (t (13) = 2.31, $p<.05$) than those who felt they did not do well.

When data from the experimental group was divided according to internal and external scores on The Rotter Locus of Control Test, significant differences were found on the pre-DACL and post-DACL means. The external experimental subjects showed significantly more depression on the pre-DACL (t (28) = 2.86, $p<.05$) as well as the post-DACL (t (28) = 13.43, $p<.05$). However, the change in affect was more pronounced among the internals, whose differential mean between the pre and post DACL was - 4.3, as opposed to the differential of the externals, which was - 97.

Data for subjects displaying the attributional style of internal, stable, global was separated and compared to data for subjects with other attributional styles. It was found that 43.10% of all subjects displayed an internal, stable, global attributional style and this style was found to occur with the highest frequency composing 30.0% of all experimental subjects and 57.14% of all control subjects. It was more predominant among females than males, representing 51.72% and 34.48% respectively. Experimental subjects with the internal, stable, global attributional style scored significantly higher on mean number of concepts correct on the second three concept formation tasks when compared to experimental subjects with attributional styles other than internal, stable, global (t (19) = 2.32, $p<.05$). Internal,

stable, global experimental subjects scored higher on the last three concept formation tasks than internal, stable, global control subjects (t (14) = 2.21, $p<.05$). Experimental subjects who were internal, stable, global (t (31) = 3.31, $p<.05$), were more depressed according to the post-DACL.

When scores between The Rotter Locus of Control Test and the BASQ were compared on the external to internal attributional continuum there was a correlation of 37.93%. An additional 20.69% of subjects were neutral on the external to internal scale of the attributional style questionnaire.

Dicussion

This experiment represents an attempt to examine the theory of learned helplesness as postulated by Martin E. Seligman (1975). Learned helplessness is the acceptance of what seems to be the unalterable consequences of a situation on the basis of previous experience even under controllable circumstances. This experiment examined four hypotheses researched by Seligman and others all of which have been previously supported. Two of Seligman's hypotheses examined in this experiment were that: two deficits, cognitive and emotional, will be produced in subjects who encounter an uncontrollable experimental situation; and following the reformulated model of learned helplessness, subjects who display an attributional style of internal, stable, and global will be predisposed to induction of learned helplessness and show greater deficits than subjects with other attributional styles.

Following the findings of other literature on learned helplessness, the last two hypotheses stated that experimental females would be expected to show a greater degree of depression than experimental males as measured by pre and post affect scores before and after a similar cognitive task involving uncontrollable failure; and according to a subjects' perception of performance at the end of the experiment, the majority of subjects that felt they did well on the concept formation tasks would evidence an internal attributional style.

Results did not support Seligman's research that showed performance deficits on tasks following uncontrollability. The Theory of Reactance (Brockner & Gardner, 1983; Pittman & Pittman, 1979) is offered as an explanation for this finding. It has been shown that an individual's initial expectation of control may effect the response to uncontrollability. According to reactance theory, individuals who expect control (internals) when confronted with small amounts of failure react by trying harder on subsequent tasks. It was found that experimental subjects scored higher on the last three concept formation tasks than control subjects, thus a clear demonstration of reactance theory. In order to produce a performance deficit, it is necessary to have experimental subjects experience a greater degree of failure during pretreatment.

The hypothesis that learned helplessness will result in an emotional deficit was supported. Peterson and Seligman (1984) researched risk factors for depression and related those factors

to learned helplessness. The findings of this experiment supported the depression model of learned helplessness and showed differences in affect between the experimental and control groups. It was found that both male and female experimental subjects were significantly more depressed than the control group following the induction of helplessness.

The hypothesis predicting that the internal, stable, global attributional style will be reflected in experimental subjects who show symptoms of learned helplessness was supported on the internal dimension, in that more depression was found among internals. Kupier (1978) noted that the element of self-blame for an outcome represented a personal and internal attributional style and found that depressives consistently made internal attributions.

The findings of this experiment did not support the hypothesis stating that experimental females will be expected to show greater degree of depression than experimental males after encountering uncontrollability. This is contrary to the findings of Baucom and Danker-Brown (1984) where it was found that failure on concept formation tasks produced a dysphoric mood in women and a study by Baucom (1983), which related societal factors to an increase in depression in women.

The results of this experiment support the final hypothesis that subjects who felt they did well would have an internal attributional style. It was found that both control subjects and

experimental subjects who felt they did well were significantly more internal, as well as more global, than those subjects who felt that they did not do well. Measures of perception of performance and individual attributional styles have not been discussed in much of the previous literature on learned helplessness. It is felt that more research should be done relating perception of performance to attributional style and depression under circumstances of learned helplessness.

In summary, the major conclusion drawn from this research implicates a strong relationship between what has been defined as learned helplessness and shifts in affect following uncontrollability. This experiment was a good demonstration of reactance theory, which accounted for the absence of performance deficits in experimental subjects. It is felt that future research on learned helplessness should not only center around attribution theory, but also individuals' perceptions of performance under conditions of uncontrollability. It is clear that the amount of failure encountered during uncontrollable pretreatment conditions effects subsequent performance, by either enhancing or debilitating cognitive abilities, and that only large amounts of failure produce the type of cognitive deficit found in earlier research on learned helplessness. This experiment did not provide an adequate measure of the motivational deficit predicted by Seligman's research and it is felt that there is an important relationship between an individual's affective state and

subsequent motivation to perform. Future research should more closely examine the relationship between motivation and emotion and the degree of learned helplessness seen in individuals.

References

Abramson, L. Y., Seligman, M. E. P., and Teasdale, J. D. (1978). Learned helplessness in humans: Critique and reformulation. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 87(1), 14-22.

Alloy, L. B., & Abramson, L. Y. (1979). Judgment of contingency in depressed and nondepressed students: Sader but wiser? Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 108(4), 441-485.

Baucom, D. H. (1983). Sex role identity and the decision to regain control among women: A learned helplessness investigation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44(2), 334-343.

Baucom, D. H., & Danker-Brown, P. (1984). Sex role identity and sex stereotyped tasks in the development of learned helplessness in women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46(2), 422-430.

Bauer, A. (1987). Bauer Attributional Style Questionnaire (BASQ). An unpublished questionnaire.

Brockner, J., & Gardner, M. (1983). The roles of self-esteem and self-consicousness in the Wortman-Brehm model of reactance and learned helplessness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45(1), 199-209.

Cole, C. S., & Coyne, J. C. (1977). Situational speciticity of laboratory-induced learned helplessness. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 86, 615-623.

Golin, S., Sweeney, P. D., & Shaeffer, D. E. (1981). The causality of causal attributions in depression: A cross-lagged panel correlational analysis. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 90(1), 14-22.

Kupier, N. A. (1978). Depression and Causal attributions for success and failure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36(3), 236-246.

Lubin, B. (1981). Depression adjective check list. San Diego: Educational & Industrial Testing Service.

Maier, S. F., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1976). Learned Helplessness: Theory and evidence. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 105, 3-46.

Mikulincer, M. (1986). Attributional processes in learned helplessness paradigm: Behavioral effects of global attributions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51(6), 1248-1256.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1984). Causal explanations as a risk factor for depression: Theory and evidence. Psychological Review, 91(3), 347-374.

Pittman, M. L., & Pittman, T. S. (1979). Effects of amount of helplessness training internal-external locus of control on mood and performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37(1), 39-47.

Raps, C. D., Peterson, C., Reinhard, K. E., Abramson, L. Y., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1982). Attributional style among depressed patients. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 91, 102-108.

Richards, K., & Bhavnani, K. K. (1984). How a concept is formed: Prototype of contingency abstraction? British Journal of Psychology, 75, 507-519.

Roth, S., & Kubal, L. (1975). Effects of noncontigent reinforcement of tasks of differing importance: Facilitation and learned helplessness. Journal of Personality and Social Psycholgoy, 32, 680-691.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectances for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80(1), 609.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). The Rotter Locus of Control Test

Seligman, M. E. P. (1975) Helplessness: On depression, develpment, and death. San Francisco: Freeman.

Wenar, C. (1983). Psychopathology from infancy through adolescence. U.S.: Random House, Inc.

Wortman, C. B. & Brehm, J. W. (1975). Responces to uncontollable outcomes: An integration of reactance theory and the learned helplessness model. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in experimental social Psychology (vol. 8) New York: Academic Press.

Table 1

Measures of Cognitive and Emotional Deficits in Experimental and Control Groups

	Experimental Subjects (n=30)		Control Subjects (n=28)		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	t
$\bar{X}$ no. concepts correct on second set of concept formation tasks	2.53	0.09	2.47	0.15	0.93
Pre-DACL $\bar{X}$	9.53	0.21	7.90	0.42	19.08*
Post-DACL $\bar{X}$	12.35	0.23	7.61	0.96	26.20*
Differential DACL $\bar{X}$	-2.82	0.03	0.29	0.54	31.21*

*$p < .001$

Table 2

Differences in Attributional Style Among Male and Female, Experimental and Control Subjects

	External Internal			Unstable Stable			Specific Global		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	$\bar{X}$	SD	t
Experimental									
(n=30)	4.97	0.14		4.67	0.76		4.33	0.28	
			7.58**			6.88**			14.71**
Control									
(n=28)	5.58	0.04		5.57	0.35		5.29	0.21	
Male									
Experimental									
(n=15)	5.20	0.90		4.06	0.55		4.53	0.04	
			0.87			6.20**			2.60*
Female									
Experimental									
(n=15)	4.91	0.93		5.23	0.49		3.85	1.01	
Male									
Control									
(n=14)	4.96	0.65		6.13	1.24		4.67	0.94	
			4.94**			1.02			0.37
Female									
Control									
(n=14)	5.83	0.11		5.70	0.99		4.79	0.76	

*p<.05; **p<.001

Appendix A

CONSENT FORM

We are doing a study to learn more about human problem solving and emotions. It will require about 30 or 40 minutes of your time. You will be requested to solve a number of concept identification problems and to fill out several personality and mood inventories. Your answers will be kept confidential and no names will be reported in any published data. At the end of the experiment, you will be debriefed.

I understand that no risks are anticipated and that the full study will be explained during debriefing. I may withdraw at any time during the experiment if I so desire. However, I agree to stay for the defriefing. Thank you for participating.

_____ _____

(Participant signature) (Date)

Appendix B

CHECK LIST

DACL FORM E

By Bernard Lubin

Name_____ Age_____ Sex_____

Date_____ Highest grade completed in school_____

DIRECTIONS: Below you will find words which describe different kinds of moods and feelings. Check the words which describe How You Feel Right Now. Some of the words may sound alike, but we want you to check all the words that describe your feelings. Work rapidly and check all of the words which describe how you feel Right Now.

1. __ Unhappy
2. __ Active
3. __ Blue
4. __ Downcast
5. __ Dispirited
6. __ Composed
7. __ Distressed
8. __ Cheerless
9. __ Lonely
10. __ Free
11. __ Lost
12. __ Broken
13. __ Good
14. __ Burdened
15. __ Forlorn
16. __ Vigorous
17. __ Peaceful
18. __ Well
19. __ Apathetic
20. __ Chained
21. __ Strong
22. __ Dejected
23. __ Awful
24. __ Glum
25. __ Great
26. __ Finished
27. __ Hopeless
28. __ Lucky
29. __ Tortured
30. __ Listless
31. __ Safe
32. __ Wilted
33. __ Criticized
34. __ Fit

Appendix B

CHECK LIST

DACL FORM F

By Bernard Lubin

Name_____Age_____Sex_____

Date_____Highest grade completed in school_____

DIRECTIONS: Below you will find words which describe different kinds of moods and feelings. Check the words which describe How You Feel Right Now. Some of the words may sound alike, but we want you to check all the words that describe your feelings. Work rapidly and check all of the words which describe how you feel Right Now.

1. __ Sorrowful
2. __ Lively
3. __ Uneasy
4. __ Tormented
5. __ Low-spirited
6. __ Clean
7. __ Discouraged
8. __ Suffering
9. __ Broken-Hearted
10. __ Easy-going
11. __ Downhearted
12. __ Washed Out
13. __ Playful
14. __ Joyless
15. __ Despairing
16. __ Gay
18. __ Successful
19. __ Rejected
20. __ Cresttfallen
21. __ Jolly
22. __ Deserted
23. __ Grieved
24. __ Low
25. __ Steady
26. __ Wretched
27. __ Terrible
28. __ Inspired
29. __ Woeful
30. __ Unworthy
31. __ Joyous
32. __ Destroyed
33. __ Somber

Appendix B

CHECK LIST

DACL FORM G

By Bernard Lubin

Name_____ Age_____ Sex_____

Date_____ Highest grade compleded in school_____

DIRECTIONS: Below you will find words which describe different kinds of moods and feelings. Check the words which describe How You Feel Right Now. Some of the words may sound alike, but we want you to check all the words that describe your feelings. Work rapidly and check all of the words which describe how you feel Right Now.

1. __ Heartsick
2. __ Healthy
3. __ Sad
4. __ Afflicted
5. __ Lonesome
6. __ Fine
7. __ Alone
8. __ Gloomy
9. __ Depressed
10. __ Alive
11. __ Heavy-hearted
12. __ Failure
13. __ Glad
14. __ Despondent
15. __ Sunk
16. __ Optimistic
17. __ Jovial
18. __ Enthusiastic
19. __ Bleak
20. __ Griefstricken
21. __ Eager
22. __ Drained
23. __ Desolate
24. __ Miserable
25. __ Merry
26. __ Dull
27. __ Melancholy
28. __ Interested
29. __ Unwanted
30. __ Gruesome
31. __ Whole
32. __ Oppressed
33. __ Lifeless
34. __ Elated

Appendix C

Name or Number_____

Date of Birth_____

Sex_____Today's Date_____

ANSWER SHEET

FOR EACH NUMBERED PAIR OF STATEMENTS IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE, MAKE AN X THROUGH EITHER A OR B BELOW, CORRESPONDING TO THE STATEMENT YOU AGREE WITH MOST

1.	A	B	11.	A	B	21.	A	B
2.	A	B	12.	A	B	22.	A	B
3.	A	B	13.	A	B	23.	A	B
4.	A	B	14.	A	B	24.	A	B
5.	A	B	15.	A	B	25.	A	B
6.	A	B	16.	A	B	26.	A	B
7.	A	B	17.	A	B	27.	A	B
8.	A	B	18.	A	B	28.	A	B
9.	A	B	19.	A	B	29.	A	B
10.	A	B	20.	A	B			

Appendix C

INSTRUCTIONS

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief: obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Your answers to the items on this inventory are to be recorded on a separate answer sheet which is loosely inserted in the booklet. REMOVE THE ANSWER SHEET NOW. Print your name and any other information requested on the answer sheet, then finish reading these directions.

Please answer these items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to find an answer for every choice. Find the number of the item on the answer sheet and make an X through either a or b whichever you choose as your answer.

In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Aslo try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choices.

Appendix C

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.
2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people´s lives are partly due to bad luck.
   b. People´s misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don´t take enough interest in politics.
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   b. Unfortunately, an individual´s worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   b. Most students don´t realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
   b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don´t like you.
   b. People who can´t get others to like them don´t understand how to get along with others.
8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one´s personality.
   b. It is one´s experiences in life which determine what they´er like.
9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
   b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to tke a definite course of action.

10.a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.

b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

11.a. Becoming a sucess is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12.a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.

b. This world is run by ther few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13.a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.

b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many thinsg turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14.a. There are certain people who are just no good.

b. There is some good in everybody.

15.a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.

b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

16.a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.

b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17.a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.

b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people

can control world events.

18.a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.

b. There really is no such thing as "luck".

19.a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.

b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

20.a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.

b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

21.a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.

b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22.a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.

b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23.a. Sometimes I can's understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.

b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24.a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.

b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

25.a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.

b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26.a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.

b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27.a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.

b. Team sports are an excellent way to built character.

28.a. What happens to me is my own doing.

b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

29.a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.

b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on the local level.

Appendix D

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this experiment is to figure out the correct answer from a series of 10 cards. In each set of cards the answer is one of eight responses that was pre-determined to be correct.

The eight possible answers are one of the following:

Circle	Square
L	Z
Orange	Green
Small Letter	Large Letter

Please say (right) or (left) to indicate which side you feel the correct answer is on and after each answer, I will tell you if your choice is correct or incorrect. Then we will go to the next card. For example, if you feel "Z" is correct, then choose the side on which "Z" appears.

At first you will use trial and error, but after a few trials you should be able to determine the correct answer.

Do you have any questions?

Once the experiment begins, please do not ask any questions.

Now we will begin.

Remember to say (left) or (right) to indicate if the correct answer is one of the following:

Circle, Square, L, Z, Orange, Green, Small Letter or Large Letter.

Appendix D

Name_____

'L'	Blue	Square	
1. L ____	1. * L ____	1. * L ____	
2. * L ____	2. R ____	2. R ____	
3. R ____	3. L ____	3. * R ____	
4. * R ____	4. L ____	4. L ____	
5. * L ____	5. * R ____	5. * R ____	
6. R ____	6. L ____	6. L ____	1._____
7. * R ____	7. R ____	7. * R ____	2._____
8. * L ____	8. * R ____	8. R ____	3._____
9. R ____	9. * R ____	9. * L ____	
10. L ____	10. * L ____	10. L ____	1._____
			2._____
*_____	*_____	*_____	3._____
Large	Purple	Circle	

1. R ____	1. R ____	1. R ____
2. L ____	2. L ____	2. L ____
3. L ____	3. R ____	3. L ____
4. L ____	4. R ____	4. R ____
5. R ____	5. L ____	5. L ____
6. L ____	6. L ____	6. R ____
7. R ____	7. L ____	7. L ____
8. L ____	8. R ____	8. R ____
9. R ____	9. L ____	9. L ____
10. L ____	10. L ____	10. R ____
_____	_____	_____

Appendix E

_____

Name

Bauer Attributional Style Questionnaire (BASQ)

Please circle the answer which is most applicable.

Do you feel that you did well on this experiment?

Yes No

You may or may not have performed up to your usual or standard ability; your performance is a function of the following:

Totally due to circumstances beyond my control 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Totally due to myself

If you are tested in the furure, is this reason(s) likely to be present again?

Never will be present again 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Will always be present

Is the reason(s) something that just influences your performance on tests or does it apply to other areas of life as well?

Influences just this situation 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Influences all situations in my life

Please explain the reason(s) for your good or bad performance on the concept formation tasks.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix F

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

This is the end of the experiment. Thank you for participating. What I would like to do now is de-brief you. I want to explain what the experiment was and to give you an understanding of what happened.

Helplessness is a phenomenon that is often produced when a person feels out of control. I tried to produce a feeling of helplessness in you by giving you incorrect feedback on the Concept Formation Tasks. I made it impossible for you to get the correct answer. That may have made you feel depressed, which made it hard for you to get correct answers on the last three sets.

So how do you feel now?

How did you feel after the first three Concept Formation Tasks?

How did you feel after the second three Concept Formation Tasks?

Did you ever feel that I was misleading you with wrong answers?

If you wish, we may now try a Concept Formation Task, receiving correct feedback. Would you like to try this?

Again, thank you for participating. I must ask you not to discuss this experiment with anyone, because we will be testing many other students throughout the next year. Since it is so important that future participants not know what is involved before testing.